

REMARKS

Claims 1-36 are pending in the application herein. In the office response, the Examiner stated Claims 1-10, 23-25, and 36 are allowable. In addition, the Examiner stated that Claim 31 is allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner rejected claims 11-22, 26-30, and 32-35.

Although not shown as rejected on the coversheet, the Examiner also rejected claim 23 elsewhere in the office action. Likewise, the Examiner did not state any grounds for the rejection of Claim 13.

Applicant's attorney telephoned the Examiner to clarify the status of Claims 13 and 23. The Examiner agreed that Claim 23 was allowable and that Claim 13 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully traverse each ground of rejection and request reconsideration and further examination of the application. To place application in allowable form, the Applicants respond to each ground for rejection and objection as follows:

A. Figures 1-3 are amended to comply with MPEP § 608.02(g) requiring "Prior Art" designation.

The Examiner objected to Figures 1-3 as containing only "old" art. In conformance with the Examiner's comments regarding MPEP § 608.02(g), Figures 1-3 are herein amended to include a "Prior Art" legend. Appendix A contains the annotated marked-up drawings of Figures 1-3. Furthermore, Appendix B contains the replacement

sheets for Figures 1-3. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Fig. 1-3 are now non-objectionable.

B. Changes to specification obviates Examiner's objection to Fig. 5 for failure to comply with 37 CFR 1.84 (p)(4) and correct ambiguities in the specification.

The Examiner objected to the drawing labeled Fig. 5 as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84 (p)(4). The objections are that (1) the specification designates reference character '551' as both an amplifier and a multiplier; and (2) Fig. 5 showed neither labels "a" nor "b" as described in the specification. Applicants obviate both objections by amending the paragraph identified by the Examiner, on page 15 beginning on line 6 of the specification, as described above. The Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed amendment obviates the objections to both Fig. 5 and the specification, thereby placing the application in an allowable form.

C. Applicant's proposed new title of the invention is sufficiently descriptive to obviate Examiner's objection.

The Examiner avers that the title of the invention is not descriptive. Applicants respectfully submit that the current application title is sufficiently descriptive to indicate the invention that is being claimed. However, in order to place promptly the application in allowable form, the Applicants hereby amend the title of the Application as described above. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that proposed amendment obviates the Examiner's objection and places the application in an allowable form.

D. Deleting duplicate paragraph on page 6 obviates Examiner's objection to duplicate paragraph in specification.

The Applicants hereby deletes the duplicate paragraph on page 6 of the specification as identified by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully

submitted that the amendment obviates the Examiner's objection and places the application in allowable form.

E. Claims 11-12, 14-22, 26-30, and 32-35 are cancelled without prejudice to obviate Examiner's rejections.

The Examiner rejected claims 11-12, 14-22, 26-30 and 32-35. As previously discussed, Claims 11-12, 14-22, 26-30, and 32-35 are cancelled without prejudice. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment obviates the Examiner's objection and places the application in allowable form.

F. Amended form of Claim 13 is allowable subject matter.

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for indicating that Claim 13 would be allowable subject matter if placed in independent form. Claim 13 is now amended in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the amended Claim 13 is in an allowable form.

G. Amended form of Claim 31 is allowable subject matter.

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for indicating that Claim 31 would be allowable subject matter if placed in independent form. Claim 31 is now amended in the manner suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, the Applicant's respectfully submit that amended Claim 31 is in an allowable form.

H. Claims 1-10, 23-25, and 36 are allowable subject matter.

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for indicating the allowable subject matter of Claims 1-10, 23-25, and 36.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests such action. Should it facilitate allowance of the application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the amount of \$420 to the credit card detailed on the attached form PTO-2038. No additional fees are believed to be necessary, however, should any fees be deemed required, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 23-3030, but is not to include payment of issue fees.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Troy J. Cole

Reg. No. 35,102

Woodard, Emhardt, Moriarty,

McNett & Henry LLP

Bank One Center/Tower

111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700

Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137

(317) 634-3456